

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6-17, 19 and 20 were rejected. Claims 4, 5, 18 and 21-25 were objected to. Claims 8, 9, 17, 19 and 21 have been amended. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 5 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Applicants also gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 21-25 are allowed.

Claim Objections

Claims 21-25 are objected to for the reason set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

Applicants have amended claim 21 to address all issues raised by Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the claim objection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,376) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20020054256).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Park and Kim does not disclose or suggest *a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a substrate*, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 17.

As recognized by the Examiner, Park does not disclose or suggest a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a substrate.

Kim does not disclose or suggest the above feature. Examiner states that Kim discloses that the pixel electrode has a first height at the reflecting area and a second height at the transmitting area wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to the substrate. See page 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree. Kim discloses a transparent electrode (132) having the same height with respect to a substrate (101), whether at a reflecting area or at a transmitting area. (See Fig. 4).

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Park and Kim were combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest *a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a substrate*, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 17 are allowable for additional reasons. For example, the combination of Park and Kim does not disclose or suggest *a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area*, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 17.

Park does not disclose or suggest a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area. Examiner states that a reflecting area (68) has a first edge extended to a transmitting area (60) in Fig. 6. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that element (60) or the area where the element (60) is located is not a transmitting area. In

stark contrast, the area where the element (60) is located is a boundary between two unit pixel areas defined by data lines (60) and gate lines (50). See Figs. 4 and 6. The transmitting area disclosed by Park is **element (72)** having a rectangular shape.

Kim does not disclose or suggest a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area.

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Park and Kim were combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest *a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area*, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 17.

Claims 2, 6 and 7 depend upon claim 1. Claim 19 depends upon claim 17. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons provided for the allowable base claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17 and 19 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park and Kim in view of Ha (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,081).

Claim 3 depends upon claim 1. Claim 3 is believed to be patentable over the combination of Park, Kim and Ha for at least the same reasons given above for the base claim 1 because the Park, Kim and Ha combination does not disclose or suggest the embodiments recited in claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-11, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park in view of Baek (U.S. Application Publication No. 20020036730).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of cited references does not disclose or suggest *a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a lower substrate*, as essentially recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Park does not disclose or suggest a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a lower substrate, as essentially recited in claim 8.

Baek does not disclose or suggest this feature. In contrast, Baek discloses a pixel electrode (120) having **a single height** at a reflecting area and at a transmitting area with respect to a lower substrate (110). (See. Fig. 3).

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Park and Baek were combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest *a pixel electrode having a first height at a reflecting area and a second height at a transmitting area, wherein the first height is greater than the second height with respect to a lower substrate*, as essentially recited in claim 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable for additional reasons. For example, the combination of Park and Baek does not disclose or suggest *a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area*, as essentially recited in claim 8.

Park does not disclose or suggest a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area for the same reasons provided above.

Baek does not disclose or suggest a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area.

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Park and Baek were combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest *a reflecting plate having a first edge extended to a transmitting area*, as essentially recited in claim 8.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 15 and 16 depend upon claim 8. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons provided for the allowable base claims.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park and Baek in view of Auman (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,432).

Claim 12 depends upon claim 8. The claim rejection is based, in part, on the rejection of claim 8, based on the combination of Park and Baek. However, as explained above, the combination of Park and Baek is legally deficient to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 8. Therefore, the dependent claim 12 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for base claim 8.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park and Kim in view of Auman.

Claim 20 depends upon claim 17. The claim rejection is based, in part, on the rejection of claim 17, based on the combination of Park and Kim. However, as explained above, the combination of Park and Kim is legally deficient to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 17. Therefore, the dependent claim 20 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for base claim 17.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park, Kim, and Baek in view of Ha.


Claim 13 depends upon claim 8. The claim rejection is based, in part, on the rejection of claim 8, based on the combination of Park and Baek. However, as explained above, the combination of Park and Baek is legally deficient to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 8. Therefore, the dependent claim 13 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for base claim 8.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park, Kim and Baek in view of Acosta (U.S. Application Publication No. 20030067575).

Claim 14 depends upon claim 8. The claim rejection is based, in part, on the rejection of claim 8, based on the combination of Park and Baek. However, as explained above, the combination of Park and Baek is legally deficient to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 8. Therefore, the dependent claim 14 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for base claim 8.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-25, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889